

Interview with Congressman Henry Hyde, Second Session

Date: 8 November 2005

Location: Office of Congressman Henry Hyde, Washington D.C.

Present: Congressman Henry Hyde and Dr. Fred W. Beuttler.

Transcribed by Roger L. Robinson

Dr. Fred W. Beuttler: Well, thank you for taking time out during a busy legislative schedule.

Congressman Henry Hyde: Do you need a place to put your documents? You could pull that out and use that seat.

FWB: Okay. I may use that. There may be a couple of things that I want to refer to. I'd like to use a back up recorder too, just in case. I don't always trust the batteries (testing his equipment) Okay. Last time, we had just got up to the beginning of your congressional career. Maybe we can start there because you've had a long career in the House. So let's start at 1975.

HH: That's right. It was January of 1975. Well, I had to make a decision, as all freshmen do, as to what committees you'd like to serve on. I was very interested in foreign affairs. So I requested that I be assigned to that committee. And the other committee was judiciary. As a lawyer, I felt that that would be helpful, and I would be at home with the issues we discussed. Well, I didn't have any difficulty getting on the judiciary committee because, in those days, they only named lawyers, which narrowed the pool from which they drew.

In any event, Foreign Affairs, or International Relations as we call it, was a much sought after committee. There were two other Illinois Republicans, Paul Findley and Edward Derwinski, were both on the committee as Republicans. They thought a third Illinoisan would be too much. So I was not selected for that committee. I was assigned to the Banking Committee. It was a subject that I had moderate interest in, but it was an active committee. So I accepted the assignment.

One of the most interesting things I did as a member of the Banking Committee was to take a trip to Cuba with the committee. I met Fidel Castro, and I observed a country under the grip of communism, how it operated and that sort of thing. I couldn't tell you the year, but it was shortly after my coming to Congress as a member. Beyond that, the most interesting thing was the so called Hyde Amendment, which came about rather fortuitously. I was on the floor while the debate was raging on funding for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It's now known as Health and Human Services. But back then, it was H.E.W. I'm going to take a pause. I've got a cold, and it's a terrible day.

FWB: Sure. Do I need to get you some water?

HH: Oh, this will be fine (taking something for his throat). I was on the floor while the debate was going on for the funding for this agency of government, which was a very big one. It wasn't well attended. There were a few people on the floor listening to the debate. Most of the people were in their offices watching it on television. A member from Maryland, named Robert Bauman, approached me while I was standing in the back of the chamber. And he remarked that there was fifty million dollars in the bill to pay for three hundred thousand Medicaid abortions, and that we could make an issue of that if we wanted to. I said, "Sure. Why don't you offer the amendment?" He said, "They know me and where I'm coming from. But they don't know you." Not of it made a lot of sense. But anyway, that was all right. So I said, "Well, I'll do it."

So Bauman went up and got a sheet of paper and scribbled out the amendment, striking from the bill the fifty million dollars to pay for these abortions. Much to everyone's surprise, including my own, my amendment passed. I was very surprised because I was told that abortion was not a subject that was warmly received by members. They'd rather that it would just go away. In any event, not expecting it to pass, it did pass. We have a process in debating bills that when an amendment is adopted, at the end of the debate and when you're moving towards final passage, the speaker asks if there are

any separate motions to strike an amendment that's been adopted. In other words, you get a second chance to strike an amendment that has been adopted. In other words, you get a second chance to defeat an amendment. And of course, the speaker asked if there were any requests for a separate vote on any amendment that passed.

My amendment was immediately challenged by such colorful figures Bella Abzug, Pat Schroeder, and Yvonne Brathwaite Burke. She later became the attorney general of California. There were also several prominent women who immediately supported the motion to set aside my amendment, which had been adopted. Low and behold, following the debate in which I had participated, we got a bigger vote than we got the first time. My amendment passed comfortably. I didn't realize what was ahead of me. But the senators, when this amendment got over to them, weren't too worried because they immediately had an appeal in the federal courts, declaring my amendment unconstitutional. So that happened within a couple of days after it passed.

Planned Parenthood the National Abortion Rights Action League, and some other private groups that support abortion appealed in the federal court. And they went to New York. It went to Judge Dooling in Brooklyn for federal court. I don't know why they picked that one, other than they must have known he was friendly to them. That happens a lot. It's called forum shopping. In any event, Judge Dooling called my amendment unconstitutional and joined its implementation. I got in the case. I asked Lee to intervene as a friend of the court. I got a few other legislators and a couple of senators. There was Senator [James] Buckley who came down from New York. There was an Oklahoma senator. There was a senator from North Carolina, who was Jesse Helms.

We all filed a brief with the court. They had a trial. I testified at the trial up in Brooklyn. And the judge found that my bill was unconstitutional, as denying equal protection of the law to pregnant women and non-pregnant women. We appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, because it involved the constitutionality of an act of congress. We could get a direct appeal from the trial. We could bypass the appellate court, the court of appeals, and go to the Supreme Court. We did. And the Supreme Court took our case,

which is quite a battle because there are only so many cases that they entertain every year.

They took our case. It was under the title *Harris v. McRae*. All of this happened in 1976, the passing of the Hyde Amendment and the court action, 1976 to 1977. The Supreme Court held my amendment to be constitutional. It was a five to four decision and the case was *Harris v. McRae*. Their argument was, "Why do you have a right to an abortion under *Roe v. Wade*? You don't have a right to have it paid for by the government. You have a right to free speech. You don't have the right to have the government buy you a megaphone or a typewriter."

So the right is one thing. But who pays for it? Its implementation was another thing. So that was by the narrowest of margins, but enough to prevail. The amendment was declared constitutional and has been in the law ever since. I can't think of anything remarkable beyond that, during my early years in congress. But at one point, a member passed away from Ohio and created another vacancy on the International Relations Committee. I pursued my ambition. It was finally gratified. I was named to the committee, and I yielded my Banking Committee spot and went to the International Relations Committee, where I enjoyed the subject matter, the play-by-play, the cut thrusts of the debates, and all that. It was something that I enjoyed and participated in.

FWB: What were some of the first issues that you were involved with in the Foreign Affairs Committee? That was during the early Reagan years, right?

HH: Yes. The big issue, during my terms there, involved the Iran Contra dispute. There was a lot of activity in Central America, with Castro and Cuba generating unrest. The Democrats, for some strange reason, defended the Sandinistas, who were the pro-Marxists, pro-Castro, and pro-Cuba people. And they were also pro-Russia. They were receiving aid from the Soviet Union. So, we had many a struggle over that issue. There were other issues involving nuclear warfare and proliferation of nuclear weapons. The nuclear freeze was a popular idea that caught on for a while. And a lot of peace loving

people thought that if you just declared an area a nuclear free zone, it would be immune from a Soviet bomb. I never followed that rationale. But we had many a debate on that.

At one point, there was a bill passed called the Boland Act, which forbade any aid to the Contras. The Contras were the people in Nicaragua who were on the outside. They were anti-Communist, and they were a guerrilla force fighting. And this Boland Amendment forbade us to give them any aide. So, a Marine colonel named Oliver North, who was in the White House, apparently devised a scheme whereby we would sell weapons to Iran, get the money, and give it to the Contras. And it was a backdoor way of funding the Contras, thus avoiding the strictures of the Boland Amendment. Well, that caused an explosive situation. Hearings were held and I was named to the joint committee of Senators and House members that were looking into the Iran Contra affair. I was active in that issue and on those debates. So that was one issue.

We didn't debate abortion very much after a while because the other side recognized that they were going to lose all of the time. That's because whether you're for abortion or not, it's a sensitive thing to coerce people's tax money to pay for that. So, after a while, the other side got tired of losing, and they didn't debate it. And they don't debate it anymore. Many times on weapons, there were debates. There were some members who were very articulate in opposing a military buildup, and those voices are still heard in Congress. I'm running out of recollections.

FWB: Sure. There are a couple of things. Let's stay a little bit on the abortion issue, with the Hyde Amendment, and at least some of the early years. I went back and I looked at your original speech when you gave the issue right here. And then, I also looked at some of the vote totals, some of the people who were voting in favor of your amendment, and some who were in opposition. There were a couple of things that struck me as somewhat odd. The Republicans in the Illinois delegation didn't vote consistently in favor of the Hyde Amendment, which was somewhat surprising. I noticed, for example, that John Anderson voted against the Hyde Amendment a number of times. And that struck me as a surprising vote.

HH: Well, with the people who support the abortion liberty, I've been very clever and resourceful in marketing their point of view. They stress the woman's right to choose. They don't stress the abortion to the unborn child or what it is. They diminish that or ignore that and talk only about the woman's sovereignty. And that concept, over the woman having the say over her unborn child, is never referred to as that. It's a fetus or an embryo, a clump of tissue, and a product of conception. They use many a euphemism to define the humanity of the unborn away.

So, a lot of members of Congress get confused by that. We're all for sovereignty. We're all for a woman's right to choose. We're for choice because that's what a democracy does. But if people would stop and think that choice is a live baby or a dead baby and it's not a bunch of cells in your womb; that's a nascent child, a human being. And so, over the years a lot of good people support the right of abortion. The majority of the Supreme Court do because they supported *Roe v. Wade*. It was the case from 1973 that decided seven to two that there is a right in the constitution for a woman to have an abortion. They assigned privacy as the overarching reason for that. That has persuaded a lot of people.

There are people today that vote for the right for a woman to have an abortion who, when they first got here, were pro-life. Teddy Kennedy was one. Dick Durbin, from Illinois, is another. They came here, but they got swept up by the marketing skills of the pro-choice, pro-abortion faction. We've reached a point now, where most of the Democrats, strangely enough, are the pro-abortion rights forces. And most of the Republicans are not. There are exceptions in both of those categories. But there are so-called progressive or moderate Republicans who think a woman's right to choose is important and is an important liberty. But most do not.

I saw where Jimmy Carter did a speech or did some writing a couple of days ago. He said that the Democratic Party is too wrapped up in the abortion issue. And of course, I agree with him whole-heartedly. He should have gone a little farther. And he himself

could have helped when he was president. But nonetheless, this is interesting. I've not seen this for years.

FWB: Could I ask you, for the camera, to read the Hyde Amendment? That's the one that's right there in highlighted form.

HH: (reading the Hyde Amendment) "None of the funds appropriated under this act shall be used to pay for abortions, or to promote or encourage abortions." That was the amendment I offered on June 24, 1976. That's wonderful to see this again. Good.

FWB: Yes. I was impressed with the speech and some of the language you had mentioned.

HH: I see Dan Flood. He opposed the amendment at first. Later on, he became very supportive of our amendment.

FWB: Okay. Good. I noticed that Dan Rostenkowski originally opposed it, and then in the vote, he switched.

HH: Did he?

FWB: That was interesting.

HH: Most people don't understand the nuances of abortion. They haven't thought about it. I know I'd never thought about it. I was asked when I was in the state legislature, long about 1967 or 1968, to co-sponsor an abortion bill. I think we've discussed that before.

FWB: Right.

HH: I started to think about it, and I read about it. I decided that it was a bad idea and not a good idea, and I've opposed it ever since.

FWB: Now there's one thing, looking back at abortion rights issues and the success of the Hyde Amendment in the late seventies and into the early eighties. The abortion issue was not an enormous campaign issue in 1980. But Ronald Reagan came out very strongly in favor of significant restrictions on abortion and actually

HH: Who did?

FWB: It was President Ronald Reagan. And for the first time, a sitting president actually wrote a book, *"Abortion on the Conscience of a Nation,"* that was almost completely overlooked by at least many people around here. Did you work quite a bit with President Reagan on ways to go beyond the Hyde Amendment?

HH: Actually, I did not actually work directly with the president, except that I knew of his pro-life bias or tendency or feelings. And he knew of my interest in the subject. I was once invited to dinner with the president in the White House. There were four of us, a couple of Senators and a couple of House members, at a private dinner. We spent the evening telling stories. And President Reagan impressed me with the sincerity of his views on abortion. He brought the subject up. Nobody else did. And he stressed the point that if you don't know whether that's a human life or not, where do you give the benefit of the doubt? You give it to the human life. He was strongly supportive of protecting the unborn child.

When Sandra Day O'Connor was nominated to be a member of the Supreme Court, I got a call from President Reagan. The day he announced her nomination, there had been suggestions that she had been on the short list. I had been sent some of her voting record in the State Senate in Arizona—which was not pro-life—and I was trying to get this material to the president. But he called me. It was a Monday, as I remember.

And he said he was going to name her, and that I shouldn't worry. She'd be okay on my issue. And he was so convinced of it that he arranged for me to interview Sandra Day O'Connor in a private meeting, which I did. She and I got along very well. I did not ask her outright whether she would support Roe v. Wade or repeal it. I just kind of danced around the issue, being sensitive to a nominee's right of restraint on this thing and how she'd vote on a particular case because the case wasn't before her.

I accepted her, being more comfortable in generalizations. But it was a nice interview and friendly. I gave her a book by Professor Noonan on Roe v. Wade. I wish I could think of the title. It's by John Noonan. But it was a nice interview. I had the same type of interview with Justice [Anthony] Kennedy, when Kennedy was being pushed for the Supreme Court. So our talk was also charming, friendly, interesting, and convivial. But I guessed wrong on him as I did Sandra Day O'Connor on their views towards Roe v. Wade. They were supportive of it. I, of course, opposed it. But I never asked them outright how they would vote.

FWB: Okay. I'm interested in some of the strategy that pro-life forces used after the Hyde Amendment, especially after Harris v. McRae. You had a Republican president and a Republican Senate. This was in the early Reagan years and with a very pro-life president, who was very publicly pro-life. Was there any major strategy in moving the pro-life movement forward in the eighties? And how active were you in that?

HH: There was a strategy that was worked that involved partial birth abortion, which is a pretty gruesome procedure. But we were content to ride along from year to year with the Hyde Amendment, because to repeal Roe v. Wade would require a constitutional amendment or a new Supreme Court. And one was about as difficult as the other to obtain. So we didn't try it. But we did go forward with parental consent these incremental changes and partial birth abortion.

We have succeeded every time on partial birth abortion, but the courts have struck it down repeatedly. They're going to get another chance to do so, I'm sure. I'm sure that

those cases are working their way up to the Supreme Court. But the only strategy has been incremental changes in the abortion situation as it now exists, not taking a minor across the state line for the purpose of getting an abortion, and parental consent—or parental notification would be more accurate, with the exceptions for unusual home conditions and that sort of thing. But that's where we are.

I don't believe that we can repeal *Roe v. Wade* through Congress. I think the court could. They created it, after all. So they could repeal it. But I'm not at all optimistic that there is a popular support to initiate a constitutional amendment through the legislature. There's one thing that could happen, and that's a return of the issue to the state legislature, rather than keep it a federal issue. There's really no justification for it being federal. There's no nexus between federal jurisdiction and the abortion liberty. The state courts, which always had the jurisdiction until *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, should be back into the picture. I don't know if that would mean more or less abortions or not. But I think the jurisdictional question would be better handled that way.

FWB: You didn't talk to the first President Bush regarding the abortion issue, or did you?

HH: No. But he tried to be helpful. He repealed or vetoed some bills that had the abortion license in it. I was very pleased with that. He was not a crusading pro-lifer. But he did as well as I could expect him. I was pleased with his tenure.

FWB: So he supported the incremental strategy?

HH: Yes.

FWB: Okay. Now the next president, you did have some major difficulties with, President Clinton, over the partial birth abortion issue.

HH: Well yes, President Clinton was the quintessential liberal Democrat who supports the abortion liberty. So we had to fight him all of the way through.

FWB: There were a number of times. He vetoed twice, if I remember.

HH: Yes.

FWB: There was the ban on partial birth abortion that you had passed in the Republican Congress. Maybe we could go back to your work on Foreign Affairs before you continue. I want to stay in the Reagan era and into the first Bush administration. Then, maybe in another session, or maybe later on, we could talk about after 1994, when you moved into the Republican majority. But with the Iran Contra issue and the issue on Central America, you were closely involved in that, working with the Senate and the joint committee. Describe that a little more, your role, how you saw the Reagan administration try to circumvent the Boland Amendment, and how you saw the role of, particularly, Ronald Reagan himself.

HH: People have always wondered whether Reagan knew about the selling of arms to the Iranians and taking that money and giving it to the Contras, or helping them re-arm themselves. Nobody knows today whether President Reagan had knowledge of that. I rather doubt it. But that became a big issue. And we had fought about that quite a bit. What did you want me to talk about?

FWB: Some of it was your relationship with Reagan during this particular foreign policy episode.

HH: Well, I never had a personal relationship with President Reagan. I met him several times. He was very cordial to me. He knew who I was. In fact, when he first announced that he was going to run for president, the day he made that announcement he came into

my district, which was brand new to me, too. And that was Cicero, Illinois. We had a big rally there, and he was there. He came to Cicero before then, when he had retired as governor of California. He came out for me on a fundraiser. It was a Saturday morning. I remember that he had it at a savings and loan in the parking lot. There were a lot of people there, and it was quite festive. I had a nice talk with him at the luncheon. Again, I wouldn't say that we were buddies or close friends, but it was very candid. We talked about Nixon and whether President Nixon should be prosecuted for what he did. And I remember saying, "No". Every morning, Nixon, who was the most important man in the world, woke up with a ton of lead in his stomach, knowing that he couldn't walk down the street without people booing him or hissing. And he said that having our president in prison carries with it an awful lot of baggage that he didn't think the country should endure. He said that Nixon suffered enough. That was interesting, that little sideline. In fact, I've just recalled that now, and I don't think that I've ever mentioned it before.

FWB: Yes. I hadn't heard it, reading for background on it.

HH: It was at the country club out in my district. I'm trying to think of the name.

FWB: Was it out in Bensonville?

HH: No. This was in Riverside or

FWB: Was it River Grove Country Club?

HH: No. It wasn't River Grove. It was southwest, out near Berwyn and Cicero.

FWB: Yes. It's in North Riverside. That must have been for the 1908 campaign? Or was it 1976?

HH: That was 1976.

FWB: It was 1976. Okay. So Reagan, while he was challenging President Ford for the Republican nomination, basically came out and did some shared campaign event with you.

HH: Yes he did. He made himself available.

FWB: That's interesting. I didn't realize that. I would imagine in 1980, though, he didn't campaign with you.

HH: I can't say. I can't remember. I'm not sure. If I went through my papers, I could figure it out.

FWB: You may have it.

HH: Yes.

FWB: Okay. Now, you became part of Foreign Affairs and you didn't have a close relationship with President Reagan. What do you think really happened during the Iran Contra issue? Was it Oliver North and sort of at that level? Or how close do you think the decision came to the president's office?

HH: I don't know. I have no idea. Oliver North was a—I don't want to say conspirator—but he could conspire to get things done. He was an action oriented person. And I know that his boss, Admiral Poindexter, shared his own views about supporting the Contras. And they thought, as did I, that it was tragic to cut off the Contras who were fighting against Marxism and the spread of Communism in Central America. It's the bridge between North America and South America. Congress was dominated by liberals,

who always have had a warm place in their hearts for Mr. Castro and others. I don't mean all liberals. But I mean, he would find solace among them quicker than he would among Republicans.

Mr. Reagan had his head on straight. He surrounded himself with good people who knew what the score was in Nicaragua. Finally, the Contras won. They defeated the Sandinistas. The Sandinistas submitted to an election. The conservative, Violeta Chamorro, the lady who was the publisher of the paper in Nicaragua, won the presidency. The country still isn't stable down there. Unfortunately, there are elements of instability led by President Chavez of Venezuela, who has unlimited money available to him because of the oil that they produce.

FWB: Why don't we move up to the period with President Clinton and the Republican strategy to take over in the House. Were you involved in some of the leadership issues as one of the ranking Republicans?

HH: Actually, no. I'd like to say I was a flaming leader. But there was a plethora of leadership material, led by Newt Gingrich and others, who had some pretty good ideas. The notion of a contract with America was a brilliant idea. It caught on. Most of us, we Republicans, signed on to that. It was a very productive and successful tactic. I served in the leadership for one term. I was the chairman of the Policy Committee, but I found that coming to leadership meetings virtually everyday was too debilitating. You spend an awful lot of time listening to a lot of members talk, and it was not so helpful. So I lost my zest for leadership. I became chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which is a leadership post. Then when my term elapsed, I think it was twelve years.

FWB: It's six years, with leadership.

HH: Is it six years? It's two hits. That's right. It's six years. Then I was chairman of International Relations. That was quite enough responsibility for me without running

around twisting arms on the floor as a whip has to do, or doing other chores. So I did not move in that direction. But I felt that I could be effective as a member of the general body and as a chairman of these important committees.

FWB: One of the things that Newt Gingrich had as a strategy within the Republican Party was to move significantly more aggressively than the previous minority leader, Bob Michael.

HH: That's right. Bob was just a nice guy, a wonderful guy, a great friend, honorable, and a great singer of songs. But he lacked the relentless push towards leadership. He was too nice a guy to be a successful leader. That's the sum and substance of it. He's a wonderful man and has many friends. And I wish him luck.

FWB: So you were, in some ways, encouraging the kind of young turks, say, of Newt Gingrich and others.

HH: I was pleased with Newt Gingrich. I think that he was a person of ideas and intellectual ferment. He was a very active and thoughtful member. He conceived the contract, which was very effective and still is. It's sad, that is, his career in the legislature. I think if he were there now, he would be the speaker and might be a candidate for president. But his private life got mixed up with his public life, and he left the Congress, although he still is very effective in one of the major networks.

FWB: Now, he was really only the speaker for two terms. Let's see, in 1998 he started moving out, during the impeachment issue. But I wanted to ask a question on your perspective on the transition from Newt Gingrich to Bob Livingston and what happened during that. And I know that you were involved in the impeachment. We'll get to there shortly.

HH: That all happened terribly fast. We needed a replacement for Newt Gingrich, and Bob Livingston wanted it very badly. He was selected by the members as the best available candidate. It was just a matter of a few days when he ran into the same difficulty that Newt Gingrich had ran into, an affair off the books, so to speak, that caused him to retire. And so we lost two speakers in a period of about a week or so. Denny Hastert was the Chief Deputy Whip. That brought him into the inner circle of the leaders. Denny was the perfect choice to succeed the two previous leaders. Denny was a down home man. None of the social problems that plagued others plagued him. He's been a good speaker over the years.

FWB: Did you have a close interaction with Speaker Hastert as part of the Illinois delegation before that?

HH: Not really, but we were friends. It's one of the deficiencies, of which I have many. I don't have a lot of friends. I don't socialize too much. I think I'm getting old.

FWB: I've looked at a couple of other delegations. And this is coming from Illinois. I'm interested in how the Illinois delegation works closely. Has there been a long tradition of cohesion among the Illinois delegation? Do you have a weekly lunch?

HH: Actually, yes we do. When Alan Dixon was a senator, we had our high point. It was a pleasure to go to these luncheons. There was structure. There was an order of procedure. We all got to say our say. We all signed the same letters on behalf of each other, and it was a well done operation. Since he left, frankly, I haven't been too faithful in attending. I should. That's a flaw of mine. But I lost my interest in the delegation as a structure.

FWB: Okay. And it was different after Alan Dixon, because he was a senator from Illinois.

HH: Yes. But he headed up our luncheons every month (HH pauses to accept a phone call).

FWB: We had only said an hour. I don't want to tire you. Well, I had set up another time back in Addison. So that's for December. And I figured you'd be quite busy here. But thank you for this hour. I think it's on the sixteenth of December, on a Friday.

HH: Okay. Whenever it is, I'll be there.

FWB: I had set it up with Sue. Is it?

HH: It's Sue.

FWB: It was with Sue back in the district. There, I'll bring in some more material, if you're interested for that.

HH: Sure.

FWB: I really liked the introduction to that speech. It's very interesting. I especially liked the last bit, as you described the promise of America and that life is not there. It's not just for the privileged, the planned, or the perfect, which is a great phrase.

HH: I think that one of my best speeches was on partial birth abortion. I had a good one in there. And then there was the impeachment. When we impeached the president, that Saturday or whenever it was, that was a good speech. Term limits was a good speech. I talked about what was wrong with term limits and the importance of experience. That was a good speech.

FWB: That was where you disagreed with one of the provisions of the contract.

HH: Oh, yes.

FWB: It was the Contract with America. It has a very strong term limit provision in there.

HH: I thought it was very foolish to just discard it. I see where [Michael] Oxley is retiring now. These guys lose their zest. They reach the top and then the rug is pulled out. They're lost to the party and to the country. And that's a shame.

FWB: Yes. Do you think that there's not only problems with term limits on committee chairs, but term limits on Congressional careers?

HH: Oh yes, there is with committees. They couldn't turn you down for running again.

FWB: Yes. Well, that was a provision in the contract. They wanted to limit just terms. It's counterproductive.

HH: You can't establish a reputation in six years. You have to know what you're doing and be there, and immerse yourself in legislation. You're not going to rip out six years of your life, then go back home, and expect to lead the country. Why turn your back on those people?

FWB: Yes. It's counterproductive, it seems. Well, I'm looking forward to the next time that we can get together.

HH: Okay. Well, I admire your persistence.

FWB: Well, thank you.

HH: Are you giving this to me?

FWB: You can have that if you want.

HH: I'll look this over and I'll make changes, if any.

FWB: There is one change. I heard you wrong on one point.

HH: I'll pick it up.

FWB: You'll pick it up. It was Bauman that I made a mistake on. But other than that, it should be pretty clear. And if you have anything you want to correct or change, feel free.

HH: Sure.

FWB: So I'm looking forward to seeing you in about six weeks.

HH: Great.

FWB: Take care. Thank you.

*****End of Interview*****